

that George Washington's Culper Spy Ring existed was not disclosed until 1930.

Nathan Hale of the often noted "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country" is claimed by Huntington to have been captured there and gave rise to the spy ring.

One of Culper's top spies was Robert Townsend of Raynham Hall, Oyster Bay, also known as Culper, Jr.

Townsend posed as a Tory merchant in New York City. He relayed intelligence concerning troop movements, supplies, and British plots, using an expensive spy ring, coded messages, invisible ink, and elaborate signal system using everything from drying laundry to buttons on clothing.

Their efforts turned the tide of the war by assisting Washington to outfox the British, even saving him from capture.

As Washington said, and as is recounted to members of today's CIA:

"There is nothing more necessary than good intelligence to frustrate a designing enemy, and nothing requires greater pains to obtain."

I would like to thank the North Shore Promotional Alliance, Raynham Hall, the Ward Melville Heritage Organization, and the producers of the AMC television show "Turn" for promoting the legacy of these unsung American patriots.

□ 1700

#### GIVING CONSUMERS A FINANCIAL CHOICE

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, in 2010, the Democratic majority passed the Dodd-Frank Act, a 2,300-page rewrite of America's financial laws. This sweeping law imposed significant costs on the economy, financial institutions, investors, small businesses, and American consumers.

Dodd-Frank was supposed to help lift up our economy; instead, what we got was the slowest, weakest recovery in 70 years. It was supposed to end taxpayer-funded bailouts; instead, it enshrined, permanently, Wall Street bailouts into law. It was supposed to make the financial system safer; instead, big banks got even bigger, and we have one less community bank or credit union every day. It was supposed to protect consumers; instead, higher bank fees, more expensive mortgages, fewer choices, and the most unaccountable government agency in the history of the Republic, the CFPB.

The Financial CHOICE Act moving through committee and to this floor soon will give consumers the protections they need and the opportunity for investment that has been so bottled up for many, many months—even years—in this country. The Financial CHOICE Act will be very helpful toward restart-

ing our economy and bringing back, once again, consumer choice.

Let's move this bill through.

#### PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BANKS of Indiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here with my partner, Congresswoman JAYAPAL from the State of Washington, and we are running the Progressive Caucus Special Order hour.

We are delighted to kick off this session, which is about the extraordinary revelations this week and some breathtaking developments in Washington, with a statement by our distinguished colleague from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland and the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington. Just by coincidence, Mr. Speaker, all three of us are members of the Judiciary Committee and had a very vigorous constitutional discussion this morning in a hearing on the responsibilities of the Judiciary Committee and, as well, the responsibilities of this Congress to the American people.

I think many of us offered our comments in the context that we did not speak as a Democrat or a Republican, though we are here on this floor as members of the Congressional Progressive Caucus. We really spoke to our views and commitment as Americans.

Having served in this House for a period of time where I have seen the Judiciary Committee engage vigorously in impeachment proceedings for judges and Presidents, I know that the role of the Judiciary Committee is to be assured that the government—the executive, the legislature, the judiciary—works within the context of the Constitution.

So that is the spirit and the position in which I rise this evening: to share a few thoughts and to recount for our Members why this is a week that requires further oversight and insight and further assessment of whether the actions of the Oval Office, the executive—in this instance, the White House—have really complied with the Constitution of the United States.

I would, first of all, indicate that much of what I will say I will qualify and say that the President, or a President, or any President, would have the authority to do. So although, for example, the FBI Director is given a 10-year term, the individual serves at the will of the President of the United States of America. That means that President Trump, President Obama, President Bush, President Clinton, and others would have the authority to fire this

particular individual as they would have the right to fire Cabinet officers and others. They have the right to fire the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General, which may be one of the concerns we now have as we proceed to try to get to the facts of just a whole litany of issues.

Let me recount for you, as I discuss the firing of Director Comey, that in the last couple of days we have discerned that the Trump campaign operatives spoke to Russian operatives, Russian Government officials, 18 times in the last 7 months of the campaign.

We are well aware that the former NSA Director, something I think we, as Members of Congress—I will speak for myself—have never heard of in the tenure that I have been privileged to serve in the United States Congress, that an individual who was advising the President of the United States not in the form of a lobbyist, but in the form of an adviser in national security issues, was being paid by a foreign country.

So the advice that was given, two different recommendations: one, to drag out and throw to an unknowing future a Turkish citizen who is here, who has been involved in a number of schools and good charitable work, who lives in Pennsylvania; one of his recommendations was to throw this individual who is statused, not undocumented, out into the hands of the present President of Turkey, who has been known over the years, recently, to deny political and religious rights and human rights. That was one recommendation.

The second recommendation, whether you liked it or disliked it, was to not arm the Kurds to help with the fight in Syria. That advice was given, both of those proposals as advice were given while General Flynn was on the payroll of a foreign government.

So you would have to wonder in the series of incidents how we have come to the point where the FBI Director, who was actively engaged in investigating—or the FBI, investigating General Flynn, as were congressional committees—General Flynn is now under a subpoena by, I believe, the Senate Intelligence Committee. All of that, all of those elements certainly respond that the Congress and the FBI were engaged in active investigations. I think the American people understand that.

The American people understand that if their chief of police was engaged in an active investigation of murder, one that the whole community was just outraged about, as any murder, as all the homicides that take place in a community that you desire to be safe, and one local elected official indicated that you are investigating my neighbor or you are investigating me and had the authority to fire the chief of police with the reason of one thing and then it became very clear that you were firing the chief of police who was actively engaged in a murder investigation that was going to help the whole community find the truth and bring the perpetrator to justice, you fired that police